

# CROMER PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Parochial Church Council held on 25 February 2021 at 7.30, via Zoom

## Those present:

Revd W Warren	Revd J Hodgkinson	Mrs J Austin
Mr D Loades	Mr D Masters	Mr D Orsborne
Mrs M Howard	Miss A Cottingham	Mr D Anderson
Dr R Beare	Mr P Bennett (from item 9(i))	Mrs J Boyle
Ms A Coghlan	Mr J Hodgkinson	Mr R Loten
Mrs A Orsborne	Mrs M Pallister	Mr S Purslow
Miss S Wells		

## 1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The meeting was chaired by the Vicar.

Apologies were received from Mr T Morton and Mr J Platten.

## 2. OPENING WORSHIP

The Vicar began the meeting with a reflection on Luke 18.27, "What is impossible with man is possible with God." Salvation is a gift from God and can't be earned. This is true when we become Christians and true throughout our Christian lives. It had been a difficult year, but this verse was a source of encouragement.

A time of open prayer followed.

## Opening Business

## 3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST NOT PREVIOUSLY RECORDED

As the subject of item 11, Mr D Masters declared an interest.

## 4. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 04 FEBRUARY 2021

The minutes of the meeting of 04 February 2021 were agreed as a correct record, after it was noted that Mr D Masters had been present.

## 5. MATTERS ARISING FROM THESE MINUTES NOT COVERED ELSEWHERE ON THE AGENDA

The Archdeacon's approval had been received for the Livestreaming project. Work was likely to begin on Monday 08 March and take 3 days to complete.

## 6. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF STANDING AND FINANCE ON 10 FEBRUARY 2021

### Item 4 - Composition of PCC

The following had been received by the Vicar and PCC Secretary from Mr D Orsborne in

advance of PCC.

- i. *Diocesan guidance (on their website) and Church Representation Rules (CRR) (Rule M6 (1)) indicate that Synod elections should take place before PCC elections. What is the basis for the Archdeacon's advice, and are we sure it is legal? If not, we should consult the Registrar.*
- ii. *Readers are already appointed (or not) by the will of the APCM (CRR M15(1) h). Are we sure that APCM has the power to reframe this rule so that Readers would never be appointed for their role - they can already do this on a year-by-year basis - but would always need to stand for election? If not, we should again check with the Registrar.*
- iii. *CRR allows the APCM to vary the number of elected representatives of the laity - up or down - from the 'standard numbers. (CRR M15 (9)). The APCM approved the rise from 15 to 18 in David Court's time so that each congregation could be represented on PCC roughly according to its size. This did result in a larger PCC but was a considered decision of the APCM at the time. Reducing it to 15 using the same mechanism isn't a problem but ought to be an equally considered move.*
- iv. *I'm not sure do need to give special consideration to Deanery Synod elections in a General Synod election year. Deanery Synod members are always the electors for both Diocesan and General Synod, whether it's an election year or not, so surely it's always important who we elect to appoint us there?*
- v. *The wording here should surely read "PCC would have proposed a measure in 2020..." or, even better, "PCC would have considered proposing a measure in 2020..." It's only the APCM that has the power to make this decision. The minute suggests that S&F or PCC can do this, which isn't correct.*
- vi. *I'm unclear what ex-officio members we would lose. Please can this be clarified?*
- vii. *This is not well-worded. There is no 'must' about what the APCM should do. PCC can propose such a change but it is the APCM that considers the proposal and votes to approve it (or not). The reference to Synod members being elected from within the membership of PCC is referred to above but operating in that way clearly runs contrary to CRR. Finally, I simply don't understand what the phrase "At this point, all PCC members and Synod representatives would stand down..." means. Please can "at this point" be clarified, along with why all elected members would stand down then?*

### Discussion

- a) The Vicar explained that the background for the thinking of S&F was a discussion with Archdeacon Ian at the Archdeacon's Visitation last year, in which he had expressed concern about the size of our PCC. The conversation with Archdeacon Ian had started before the pandemic but the pandemic had made us realise more than ever that we had a large PCC and that, because of this, it functioned less effectively than it might.
- b) The Vicar agreed that further guidance from the Archdeacon or Diocesan Registrar, if necessary, was required before wider discussion by PCC.
- c) The PCC Secretary explained that the reference to Deanery Synod referred to those who stood for Synod but didn't give commitment to the role.
- d) Revd Jennie Hodgkinson observed that those standing for Diocesan Synod could put themselves forward as long as they were over 16 and on the electoral roll.

- e) David Orsborne said that he wasn't averse to discussing changes but wanted to ensure things were done within the requirements of CRR.
- f) The following amendment, suggested by David Orsborne, would be made to minute 4(vii): "The past year had been unusual, and PCC would have considered proposing a measure in 2020, had things been different".

#### **Treasurer**

- a) Health issues had forced Roger Hopkins to step down and he had resigned as Treasurer. Mary Howard would send him a card on behalf of PCC.
- b) On the advice of the Diocese, the Vicar had contacted someone within the Deanery who had experience as a PCC Treasurer. He was willing to help us out in the interim. Anne Cottingham expressed concern that preparing the 2020 accounts for the External Examiner might be too challenging for someone new. The Vicar would discuss this with him.
- c) The interim Treasurer would become a member of PCC.

It was **AGREED** by a show of hands to receive the minutes of Standing and Finance 10 February 2021, subject to amendment. This decision was subsequently ratified electronically in accordance with Church Representation Rules.

#### **7. NOTES FROM THE JOINT MEETINGS OF MISSION LEADERSHIP TEAM (MLT) AND CHILDREN AND FAMILIES LEADERSHIP TEAM (CFLT) 13 JANUARY 2021 AND 27 JANUARY 2021**

- a) Jackie Austin reported that events provisionally planned for 2021 would happen if and when they were allowed to. Others could roll over to 2022.
- a) The two groups were finding it beneficial to meet together. If there were occasions when it would be more appropriate to meet separately, this could still happen but most of the events that were being planned were for children and adults. It was **RECOMMENDED TO PCC: that MLT and CFLT should become one Mission Leadership Group.**
- b) Although MLT/CFLT were mostly focussed on outreach, it was important that the discipleship element was not overlooked. The remit could be changed to encompass discipleship.
- c) In response to a question from Anna Coghlan, Jackie Austin explained that there was a Youth Leadership Team (YLT) to look at youth work, because youth had different needs to children and families. However, YLT was now depleted to 2 members. PCC had signed up to the Diocesan Youth Charter, but we were no further forward. Anna said that we needed clear remits for the groups. Jackie explained that there was a remit for each leadership team but that they might need re-consideration and further discussion after the pandemic.
- d) The Associate Vicar's remit included youth work and he/she should be in post later this year, by which time things could be returning to some normality.
- e) PCC expressed thanks to Anna Coghlan who had led the Sunday morning children's work but had now stepped down. Anna said that she was still keen to see discipleship moving forward. The Vicar said that, even after the restrictions were lifted, it would be challenging to do any children's work.

It was **AGREED** by a show of hands: **that MLT and CFLT should become one Mission Leadership Team.** This decision was subsequently ratified electronically in accordance

with Church Representation Rules.

## **8. NOTES FROM FABRIC LEADERSHIP TEAM (FLT) 15 FEBRUARY 2021**

Simon Purslow explained that, in prioritising the work needed in 2021, the group had been realistic and had accepted that in the present financial climate it was not possible to do everything. The items in the recommendation to PCC were all essentials.

It was **AGREED by a show of hands that:**

- 1. We proceed to bring the boiler in the main heating system in the Parish Church back up to standard, thereby giving it an extra 7 – 10 years of life.**
  
- 2. We proceed with the other following necessary projects:**
  - a) Lighting repairs in Parish Church**
  - b) Electrical remedial works following tests.**
  - c) Heater at St Martin's.**
  - d) Small boiler replacement for Parish Church.**

This decision was subsequently ratified electronically in accordance with Church Representation Rules.

## **9. FINANCE – Budget 2021 and Staffing**

- a) The figures supplied to PCC had been prepared by Roger Hopkins before he resigned as Treasurer and still included Mission Partners. This needed to come out.
- b) Staffing: The Vicar, Revd Jennie Hodgkinson and the Wardens had met to discuss a future staffing structure. We couldn't afford the amount of staff we'd had in the past and should be encouraging people in the church family to exercise their gifts in those tasks which would be appropriate for volunteers to undertake. This was how things had been done in the past.
- c) A lot of church life was still not happening because of the pandemic. It was proposed that our present needs could be covered by a Church Secretary (14 hours per week), finance support (14 hours per week) and a cleaner (10 hours per week). Revd Jennie Hodgkinson had calculated that, including the hours that the current Finance Assistant was working, this would cost a total of £20,000 over 8 months. This was £20,000 less than the £40,000 in the Budget for staffing at present.
- d) Responding to a question from Anne Cottingham, Revd Jennie Hodgkinson said that all the proposed posts fell under the NI contribution level and wouldn't automatically qualify for enrolment in the workplace pension scheme. If an employee wanted to join the scheme, we would have to pay 3%.
- e) In response to a further question from Anne Cottingham, Jackie said that most of the areas being considered for cover by volunteers did not have data protection implications. It would be important to have a volunteer protocol in place.
- f) If PCC supported the idea of having volunteers, a list of the vacancies requiring to be filled would be advertised.
- g) Anna Coghlan asked if volunteers would have contracts. The Vicar said that a working agreement would be good for the benefit of both sides. Revd Jennie Hodgkinson and Alison Orsborne had worked on some volunteer role descriptions some years ago. They should be reviewed.
- h) Alison Orsborne said that there were model Safeguarding pro formas for going through a review with volunteers on a yearly basis.
- i) Revd Jennie Hodgkinson asked that it should be made clear that volunteers could do

a professional job. We should be careful to value and appreciate our volunteers.

- j) The current cleaner was working 2 hours per week. It was more flexible to have our own cleaner than to use contract cleaners.
- k) The Vicar, Revd Jennie Hodgkinson and the Wardens proposed to PCC that **we should go forward with the new staffing structure with job descriptions to follow for consideration by PCC.** Responding to a question from Anne Cottingham, Jackie Austin explained that the job descriptions would be checked by Diocesan HR.
- l) Simon Purslow reminded PCC that the lighting scheme had been deferred and that the £59,000 ringfenced for it needed to be taken out of the 2021 budget.
- m) David Anderson said that a previous Treasurer had raised some questions regarding the budget. The Vicar said that these should be raised with him and that it was not appropriate to discuss it in PCC.
- n) Responding to a question from David Anderson, the Vicar said that settlements etc for the staff who had left was reached by the New Year.

It was **AGREED by a show of hands that we should go forward with the new staffing structure [Church Secretary (14 hours per week), finance support (14 hours per week) and a cleaner (10 hours per week) at a total cost of £20,000] with job descriptions to follow for consideration by PCC.**

This decision was subsequently ratified electronically in accordance with Church Representation Rules.

It was further **AGREED by a show of hands to adopt the Budget for 2021, with the removal of Mission Partners, £20,000 from the Staffing line and the sum of £59,000 for the Lighting Project.**

This decision was subsequently ratified electronically in accordance with Church Representation Rules.

## **10. APCM ARRANGEMENTS**

- a) We had initially been given to understand that we didn't have to hold the 2020 APCM but had since learned that APCMs must be held for 2020 and 2021.
- b) The Vicar suggested holding the Vestry meetings on a different day to the APCMs to avoid holding 4 meetings altogether. The dates would be 15 April for the Vestry meetings and 27 May for the APCMs.
- c) The 2020 APCM would be a short meeting to conduct legal business.
- d) The meetings would almost certainly have to be conducted via Zoom. David Osborne was happy to be part of a team to facilitate the technology.
- e) A smaller group would meet to discuss the nuts and bolts of submitting nomination papers, voting etc.
- f) Alison Osborne expressed concern that by holding the meetings via Zoom we would be disenfranchising up to 30 people and that they should at least have a postal vote. Jackie Austin said this was something that needed discussion when the finer details were worked out. The Vicar agreed that we would have to issue some postal votes.
- g) Alison said that she had a list of all those who were not on email.

It was **AGREED by a show of hands to hold the Vestry Meetings and APCMs on different dates.**

This decision was subsequently ratified electronically in accordance with Church Representation Rules.

#### **11. APPROVAL OF THE RENEWAL OF DAVID MASTERS' LICENCE AS LAY READER**

It was **AGREED by a show of hands to approve the renewal of David Masters' licence as a Lay Reader.**

This decision was subsequently ratified electronically in accordance with Church Representation Rules. David was thanked for all he did in his ministry.

#### **12. APPROVAL OF SUE BROCKLEHURST AS PARISH SAFEGUARDING OFFICER FOR CHILDREN**

Alison Orsborne was thanked for doing great work in this role after Rebecca Westall had stepped down. It was good to see that someone had come forward to fill the need.

It was **AGREED by a show of hands to approve Sue Brocklehurst as Parish Safeguarding Officer for Children.**

This decision was subsequently ratified electronically in accordance with Church Representation Rules.

#### **13. RESUMPTION OF SUNDAY WORSHIP IN CHURCH**

It was **AGREED by a show of hands that Sunday Worship (it would be a Communion Service to comply with canon law) would resume in the Parish Church at 10.30 on Sunday 28 March.** This decision was subsequently ratified electronically in accordance with Church Representation Rules.

- a) The morning services would continue to be livestreamed.
- b) Later, there was scope for a wider discussion regarding the patten of services, including the service at St Martin's.
- c) It would be good to properly celebrate the reopening of St Martin's.

#### **14. SAFEGUARDING**

- a) Sue Brocklehurst had been appointed Parish Safeguarding Officer for Children.
- b) A new Confidential Declaration Form had been received from the Diocese.
- c) Alison Orsborne was going through the DBS checks to ensure they were all up to date.
- d) The Diocese would write to Alison about the reorganisation of Safeguarding training. This was likely to take some time, but there would be leniency for training that had been completed late. The clergy were doing their training on Zoom, but it was limited to 10 per session.

#### **15. HEALTH AND SAFETY**

- a) Volunteers would need risk assessments.
- b) The Health and Safety Policy had been updated and would go to S&F in March.

## **16. ELECTORAL ROLL UPDATE**

The number on roll was 294. It was hoped that some new people would be joining us soon, as a result of online services.

## **17. CORRESPONDENCE AND DATES**

- a) Bishop Graham was visiting Cromer on 30 March as one of his visits around the Diocese in place of the Chrism Eucharist. It was likely to be a short service starting at 2.30. More details would follow.
- b) A note of appreciation had been received from Archdeacon Ian to thank us for paying our Parish Share.
- c) A letter had been sent to the Cromer Peregrine Project to thank them for their gift of £2,500.
- a) Future meeting: Thursday 25 March at 7.30, via Zoom.

The meeting closed with the Grace at 9.25 pm.